

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/612,869 07/10/2000		Giancarlo Granata	FMCV0113PUS/199-1623	9855		
29074	7590	04/20/2005		EXAMI	EXAMINER	
VISTEON				VO, I	IAI	
C/O BRINK	S HOFER	GILSON & LIONE				
PO BOX 10395				ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60610				1771		

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

M	Μ	/
1		

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/612,869	GRANATA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Hai Vo	1771				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 Fe	ebruary 2005.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This						
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar	ice except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	33 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) 14 and 16-43 is/are pending in the ap	plication.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw						
5) Claim(s) 14,16-21,36 and 41-43 is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 22-27,29-35 and 37-40 is/are rejected						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>28</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	,				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r. ·					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	aten Application (F 10-102)				

Art Unit: 1771

1. The specification objections are withdrawn in view of the present arguments (see pages 7-8 of the amendment filed on 02/07/2005).

- 2. The 112 claim rejections are withdrawn in view of the present amendment.
- 3. The art rejections over Sommer are withdrawn in view of the present amendment. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made in view of Sommer (US 5,544,912), Peube et al (US 5,655,367) and Kent (US 6,080,493).
- 4. The art rejections over Stein et al (US 5,403,645) are withdrawn in view of the present amendment. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made in view of Stein et al (US 5,403,645) in view of GB 1 244 487.
- 5. The indicated allowability of claims 23, 25-27, 30-34, 37 and 39 is withdrawn in view of the new grounds of rejections as listed above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- 6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

 A person shall be entitled to a patent unless
 - (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 7. Claims 29, 35, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sommer (US 5,544,912) as evidenced by Peube et al (US 5,655,367). Sommer teaches a supplemental inflation restraint and door arrangement comprising a polyvinyl chloride skin 38, a foam layer 50, a foam border material 48 and a door 34 (figure 2). The foam border layer 48 is from an

Art Unit: 1771

aluminum mesh which is inherently porous (column 2, lines 20-23). Likewise, it is clearly apparent that the foam border layer is impregnable. The foam layer 50 corresponds to Applicants' non-impregnable layer while the foam border layer corresponds to Applicants' impregnable layer. The skin layer 38 is bonded to the base 34 and the foam layer 48 (figure 2). A portion of the door 34 is adjacent to the sides of the foam border material (figures 2-5). Sommer does not teach the aluminum foam mesh being a reticulated material. Peube evidences that the reticulated material is in the form of a metal mesh (column 4, lines 27-30). Accordingly, it is the examiner's position that Sommer anticipates the claimed subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sommer (US 5,544,912) as evidenced by Peube et al (US 5,655,367) as applied to claim 29 above, further in view of Kent (US 6,080,493). Sommer discloses the reticulated aluminum foam. Sommer does not disclose the pore size of the reticulated aluminum foam. Ken discloses the reticulated aluminum foam commercially available with pore size from 10 to 100 pores per inch. Since the foam density is dictated by the pore size, it is the examiner's position that the

Art Unit: 1771

foam density would be inherently present within the claimed range. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the reticulated aluminum foam having the pore size as taught by Kent because of its readily availability in the market.

10. Claims 22-27, 29-34, and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stein et al (US 5,403,645) in view of GB 1 244 487. Stein teaches an interior trim component for a motor vehicle comprising a rigid backing 20, an impregnable vinyl skin 10 with various apertures 32, a non-impregnable soft foam 14 and a vinyl cover of cloth 12 (figure 12). The vinyl skin 10 is a foam material (column 2, lines 13-15). A portion of the rigid backing 20 is present through the impregnable vinyl skin 10 (column 2, lines 30-38). A portion of the rigid substrate 20 is adjacent to the sides of the impregnable layer 10 (figure 2). Stein does not teach or suggest that the foam vinyl skin 10 is a reticulated foam material. GB 1 244 487 teaches a floor covering having a surface sheet made from a reticulated polyvinyl chloride foam having a compacted pile-like surface and a pleasant resilient feel to the structure (page 1, column 48-50, example 1). GB'487 discloses the reticulated foam polyvinyl chloride having a density of 2 lb/ft3 and 20 pores per inch within the claimed range. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the polyvinyl chloride foam of Stein with the density and pore size as taught by GB'487 motivated by the desire to provide a pleasant resilient feel to the door trim.

Art Unit: 1771

Stein does not specifically disclose the shore A hardness of the interior trim component. However, the combined teachings of Stein and GB'487 arrives at the panel having a recited structure. It seems from the claim, if one meets the structure recited, the properties must be met or Applicant's claim is incomplete. Therefore, it is the examiner's position that the Shore A hardness would be inherently present.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 11. Claims 14, 16-21, 36, and 41-43 are allowed. Sommer does not teach a supplemental inflation restraint and door arrangement wherein a portion of the door substrate extends into the foam border as required by the claims. Stein does not teach an interior trim component for a motor vehicle wherein the cover skin is bonded to at least a portion of the non-impregnable layer of the pad and a portion of the substrate. None of the prior art discloses or suggests an automobile interior molded panel wherein a cover skin is bonded to at least a portion of the non-impregnable layer and a portion of the substrate; wherein at least a portion of the rigid substrate is present throughout the impregnable layer; and wherein at least a portion of the rigid substrate is adjacent to the sides of the impregnable layer.
- 12. Claim 28 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Stein does not teach an interior

Art Unit: 1771

trim component for a motor vehicle wherein the cover skin is bonded to at least a portion of the non-impregnable layer of the pad and a portion of the substrate.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai Vo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1485. The examiner can normally be reached on M,T,Th, F, 7:00-4:30 and on alternating Wednesdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hai Vo Tech Center 1700

HV